M.C. v. Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, et al.

2:06cv83-WKW

5/23/2006

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

NORTHERN DIVISION

M.C., who sues by and through her Mother and Next of Friend, Gail Tatum,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO.: 2:06cv83-WKW

LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

RICKY PHILLIPS, as Administrator of the Estate of Susan Phillips, deceased,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO.: 2:06cv84-WKW

LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

SARAH K. THOMPSON, as Administratrix of the Estate of Royce Thompson, deceased,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO.: 2:06cv85-WKW

LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.



```
Page 2
                  IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
                  FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
3
                          NORTHERN DIVISION
    LILLIAN EDWARDS, as
    Administratrix of the Estate
 5
    of Marvin Mays, deceased,
 6
              Plaintiff,
7
                                 CASE NO.: 2:06cv86-WKW
         VS.
 8
    LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION,
    et al.,
              Defendants.
10
     11
    JANICE MADDEN, as
12
    Administratrix of the Estate
    of James Madden, deceased,
13
              Plaintiff,
14
                                 CASE NO.: 2:06cv186-WKW
         VS.
15
     LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION,
16
     et al.,
17
              Defendants.
18
     19
     SHERRI L. DAVIS,
20
              Plaintiff.
21
                                  CASE NO.: 2:06cv187-WKW
         VS.
22
     LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION,
     et al.,
23
              Defendants.
24
25
```

```
Page 3
                  IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                  FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
 3
                          NORTHERN DIVISION
    THOMAS DOUGLAS, as
    Administrator of the Estate of
    Sebera Gayle Douglas, deceased,
 6
              Plaintiff,
 7
                                 CASE NO.: 2:06cv188-WKW
         vs.
 8
    LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION,
     et al.,
              Defendants.
10
     11
    LORRINE THOMPSON, as
12
     Administratrix of the Estate
     of Jerry Thompson, deceased,
13
              Plaintiff,
14
                                 CASE NO.: 2:06cv189-WKW
         vs.
15
     LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION,
16
     et al.,
17
              Defendants.
     19
     STANTON KELLEY, as
     Administrator of the Estate
20
     of William Kelley, deceased,
21
              Plaintiff,
22
                                 CASE NO.: 2:06cv190-WKW
         VS.
23
     LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION,
     et al.,
24
              Defendants.
25
```

	Page 4		
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA		
3	NORTHERN DIVISION		
4 5	GINGER CRAVEY, as Administratrix of the Estate of Riley Cravey, deceased,		
6	Plaintiff,		
7	vs. CASE NO.: 2:06cv191-WKW		
8	LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORPORATION, et al.,		
- 9	Defendants.		
10			
11			
12	* * * * * * * * *		
13	STATUS CONFERENCE		
14	* * * * * * * *		
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE W. KEITH WATKINS, UNITED STATES		
16	DISTRICT JUDGE, at Montgomery, Alabama, on Tuesday, May 23,		
17	2006, commencing at 4:02 p.m.		
18	APPEARANCES:		
19	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Mr. Robert Leslie Palmer Mr. Gregory Andrews Cade Attorneys at Law		
21	ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION GROUP, PC 3529 7th Avenue South Birmingham, Alabama 35222		
22			
23	Mr. William Eason Mitchell Attorney at Law THE COLOM LAW FIRM		
24	P.O. Box 866 Columbus, Mississippi 39703		
25	COLUMBIA PILESTSSIPPI 33103		

		Page 5	
1	APPEARANCES, Continued:		
2	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	Mr. John C. Berghoff, Jr. Attorney at Law	
3		MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW, LLP 71 South Wacker Drive	
4		Chicago, Illinois 60606-4637	
5		Mr. H. Thomas Wells, Jr. Attorney at Law	
6		MAYNARD, COOPER & GALE, PC 1901 Sixth Avenue North	
7 8		2400 AmSouth/Harbert Plaza Birmingham, Alabama 35203-2618	
		Mr. Bernard Taylor	
9		Mr. Orlyn O. Lockard, III Mr. Douglas S. Arnold	
10		Attorneys at Law ALSTON & BIRD, LLP	
11		One Atlantic Center 1201 West Peachtree Street	
12		Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3424	
13		Mr. Dennis R. Bailey Attorney at Law RUSHTON, STAKELY, JOHNSTON & GARRETT	
15		184 Commerce Street Montgomery, Alabama 36104	
16	ALSO PRESENT:	Mr. James Faulkner General Counsel, PACTIV Corporation	
17		Ms. Laura E. Proctor	
18		In-house Counsel Louisiana-Pacific Corporation	
19	Proceedings reported stenographically;		
20	transcrip	ot produced by computer.	
21	* *	* * * * * * * * *	
22			
23			
24			
25			

Page 31

- ¹ nightmare.
- THE COURT: Well, while you're up there, let's move on
- 3 to the next motion. And you asked for early -- well, early
- 4 meeting to plan the discovery. And you've alleged in your
- 5 motion -- you didn't ask to take any depositions to preserve
- testimony, but you've alleged that parties are passing away.
- And you've already said today that the plaintiff in case number
- 8 83 is now deceased. Would -- I'm assuming that the witnesses --
- 9 that the expert witnesses, at least, and the former employees,
- probably, will all be the same -- who are going to testify on
- 11 your side of the case will all be the same in all of the cases;
- is that correct?
- MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.
- 14 THE COURT: So I do intend to consolidate these cases
- for discovery only, and I'll tell you about that in a minute.
- But I'm trying to get the timing in my mind. When I enter this
- 17 ruling on the motions to dismiss and for more definite
- statement, is that going to clear you up to file the rest of
- 19 your cases?
- MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir. That clears me up. And
- Judge, we did -- I asked learned counsel about taking the
- deposition of Melanie before her death, and the answer was we'll
- get back to you Wednesday. Thursday morning, we agreed to
- schedule it, and I found out she had died the night before.
- Our -- we don't know who's going to die next or which one it's

Page 32

- going to be. I can't tell you that someone -- it happens so
- fast. I don't know how to deal with it. But we know that there
- is -- we'd like to depose the sickest people.
- 4 THE COURT: How many are you talking about?
- MR. MITCHELL: Less than ten. And some of these
- 6 chemicals also cause cognitive defects and cognitive
- deficiencies, like an early onset of Alzheimer's and
- 8 forgetfulness. And some of the ex-employees who are not old
- 9 enough to have Alzheimer's are showing the symptoms, and we
- don't know how fast they're going to go downhill. We'd like to
- get a few of the key witnesses who are starting to show
- 12 cognitive deficiencies which are consistent with this chemical
- exposure -- we'd like to get them tied down.
- 14 THE COURT: Is that in the ten or is that ten
- 15 additional or is that --
- MR. MITCHELL: I think we can put that in the ten.
- 17 THE COURT: So you're representing to the Court that it
- might be helpful to you to preserve the testimony of ten
- 19 witnesses.
- MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.
- THE COURT: All right. Let me get some responses from
- defendant.
- 23 Mr. Taylor, would you -- Mr. Berghoff?
- MR. TAYLOR: Your Honor, I think --
- THE COURT: There's room for both of you.

5/23/2006

Page 33

- MR. TAYLOR: -- we'll both walk up together on this.
- You know, obviously, generally, we want to -- we want to
- 3 cooperate and we want to help the plaintiffs with this very
- 4 serious and obviously sensitive issue. Before, however, we
- would be tasked to go and take these depositions, I think we'd
- 6 want to do some preliminary work to see maybe some medical work
- ⁷ just to see what's really going on there to see if, indeed, the
- 8 medical evidence supports the fact these folks are imminently
- 9 about to pass away.
- THE COURT: Well, Mr. Taylor, I saw a representation
- 11 probably in the plaintiffs' brief that there have been a
- truckload of medical documents already submitted.
- I will ask you, Mr. Mitchell, have -- do the defendants
- have medical records on these ten folks you say you need to
- depose?
- MR. MITCHELL: Some of the -- a few of the people would
- be the ex-employees, and they would not have medical records on
- 18 those.
- 19 THE COURT: Do you have the records on those?
- MR. MITCHELL: I do not. They're -- the ex-employees
- 21 are not plaintiffs, and these are not injured people. These are
- witnesses.
- THE COURT: How do you propose the defendants get a
- fair shot of taking someone's deposition where they don't have
- their medical records or other records available and have not

```
Page 34
```

- 1 had the benefit of interrogatory answers and requests for
- ² admissions and so forth?
- MR. MITCHELL: First of all, it's just like any other
- 4 witness. The -- now, on the plaintiffs, we -- either they have
- 5 the medical records -- I believe they have the medical records
- on all the plaintiffs. There are five live plaintiffs, and I
- think you've got -- they've got medical records on all of them.
- Judge, we'll also agree that if the parties are alive later,
- 9 they can come back and depose them again. We'd agree to put
- them up a second time. But just in fairness, people are getting
- forgetful, and they are unexpectedly coming down, relapsing, and
- dying.
- THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mitchell.
- Mr. Taylor, go ahead. Or are you finished?
- MR. TAYLOR: I think I'm finished on that point, Your
- 16 Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Berghoff?
- MR. BERGHOFF: No, I think we are -- Your Honor, we're
- in agreement with what Mr. Taylor has said.
- THE COURT: All right. So when you talk about
- background work, besides medical, is there any other?
- MR. TAYLOR: Well, not knowing who the plaintiffs are,
- yes. I would think at this point, based upon the reason that we
- would be taking the depositions, that it would be primarily
- medical stuff that we would need to get our arms around first.